Remarks/Arguments

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her careful consideration of their application and for the helpful interview of July 19, 2005. Applicant requests entry of the above amendments and requests reconsideration of this application in view of those amendments and in view of the remarks to follow.

Claims 2-26 and 28-39 are now pending in the application, with Claims 9, 18, 28, and 33 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 27 have been cancelled without prejudice to pursue their subject matter in one or more subsequent applications.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

The Office Action, at pages 2-11, rejects Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11, 13-20, 22-25, 33, 36, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al.; Claims 5, 12, 21, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. in view of Schnarel et al.; and Claims 10, 28-32, 34, 35, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. in view of Haserodt. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the remaining claims in view of the amendments above.

In particular, Claim 18 has been amended to include the limitations of (non-amended) Claim 9. Claim 18 recites that "the graphical user interface comprises a first icon to access a network site of an organization and a second icon to dial *the* telephone number of the organization using at least one of the telephone features." (Emphasis added.) By changing the

word "a" to "the" in Claim 18, Applicant submits that the claim is now clear in that the telephone

number being referred to is the telephone number of the organization whose network site is

referred to in connection with the first icon. In contrast, as discussed in Applicant's previous

Amendment and Reply (filed July 9, 2004), Wood et al., at col. 9, lines 3-13, discusses the access

and use of a national directory by clicking on a button and possibly dialing a phone number from

the directory by selecting it and clicking on another ("DIAL") button. Hence, in Wood et al., one

goes to a web site of one organization (a national directory) and uses it to obtain a phone number

for a different organization. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim

18 and the claims that depend therefrom are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 9 and 33 have been amended to better define the two claimed protocol layers, the

bi-directional protocol layer and the uni-directional protocol layer. The amendments to Claims 9

and 33 are supported, for example, by the specification at Page 11, lines 8-19. In particular,

Claims 9 and 33 now recite: (a) that the bi-directional protocol layer is to support bi-directional

communication and pulling of information from the computer system by the computer; and (b)

that the uni-directional protocol layer is to support pushing of information from the computer

system to the computer. Applicant has reviewed the cited portions of Wood et al. (col. 4, lines

32-36 and col. 7, lines 5-9), as well as their surrounding text, and are unable to find teachings or

suggestions of all of these features. For example, nowhere in Wood et al. has Applicant been

able to find a bi-direction protocol layer to support a computer pulling information from a

computer system, as claimed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9 and 33, as

well as their dependent claims (Claims 2-8, 10-17, 19-26, 38, 39 and 34-37, respectfully) are allowable over the cited prior art.

Regarding Claims 28-32, Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections for the following reasons. Before discussing the prior art, to address the Examiner's concern as discussed during the Interview of July 19, 2005, Applicant points out that the use of the word "prompt" as in, for example, Claim 28, may be found, e.g., in the specification at Page 12, lines 14 ff. For example, the specification discusses that "the network server layer 5 *prompts* the computer 6 to request from the network server layer 5 an update of the call state of the telephone 3." (Emphasis added.) "Prompt" is used here in the sense of "to give a cue." In other words, the network server layer 5 is cueing the computer 6 to request an update. Note, also, that Applicant has amended Claim 28 to clarify that the computer is being prompted to request an update. Given this understanding and amendment, Applicant believes that the arguments submitted July 19, 2004, and repeated below, should be effective.

As discussed above, Claim 28 was rejected over the combination of Wood et al. with Haserodt. In particular, the Office Action relied on Wood et al. at col. 5, lines 3-7, and col. 7, lines 5-9, to teach the sending of a refresh request to the graphical user interface to request an update on the state of the telephone. According to the Office Action, these passages address notification of state change. Wood et al. at col. 7, lines 5-9, is also relied upon by the Office Action to teach receiving an update on the state of the telephone. However, the Office Action goes on to state that Wood et al. does not specifically teach receiving an update request, but it

-15-

further asserts that Haserodt at col. 2, lines 35-39, teaches receiving a request from a graphical user interface for displaying a web page.

First, Wood et al., col. 5, lines 3-7, states, "The web page manager 36 is a software application that manages the presentation of the call management web pages to the subscriber via the web 20, and that can easily be provided in known manner to provide any desired web appearance." Applicant fails to understand how this teaches anything about sending refresh requests to a graphical user interface to request an update (i.e., to prompt a request for an update), as claimed.

Second, Wood et al. at col. 7, lines 5-9, as discussed above, treats the transmission of error/status messages from telephone switch 16 to web page manager 36. This, too, is not relevant to the limitation to which the Office Action applies it. It does not teach sending a refresh request to a graphical user interface to prompt a request for an update. It also does not teach that a graphical user interface sends an update request to receive an update on the state of the telephone, as claimed.

Turning now to Haserodt, the Office Action cites col. 2, lines 35-39 as teaching "receiving a request from the graphical user interface for displaying a web page." However, the cited passage states, "A WWW browser of a client requests a WWW page that defines a telephony feature form from a WWW server via the Internet. The WWW server responds by providing the requested WWW page to the client via the Internet." While this may teach

requesting display of a web page, it still fails to remedy the deficiencies of Wood et al., as discussed above.

Applicant has found no evidence that either Wood et al. or Haserodt, either individually or in combination, teaches the sending of a refresh request to the graphical user interface to prompt a request for an update on a state of the telephone and receiving an update request from the graphical user interface for the update on the state of the telephone. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 28, as well as its dependent claims, Claims 29-32, are allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicant has also amended Claim 11 to clarify that there is a network server layer and that it is part of the computer system.

Furthermore, Applicant has added new Claim 39 to recite that the network server layer recited in Claim 2 comprises "one or more software modules to be executed on said computer system to mediate communications between said application server and said computer." This is supported by the specification, e.g., at Page 9, lines 17-21.

Applicants respectfully state that their amendments are not to be understood as indicating concurrence with the characterizations of the claims and/or the prior art found in the Office Action.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and objections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/23/05

Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,457
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Direct Dial: (202) 344-8017
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS1\674862\1
VBHC Rev. 08/22/05 jwg